



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/502,176	02/10/2000	Steven Pirie-Shepherd	05940-0141	4843
23594	7590	02/11/2005	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 1100 PEACHTREE SUITE 2800 ATLANTA, GA 30309			HARRIS, ALANA M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1642		
DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/502,176	PIRIE-SHEPHERD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.	1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,6-12,15,16 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-12,15,16 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 15, 16 and 27 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 15, 16 and 27 are examined on the merits.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Specification

3. The disclosure is no longer objected to because Applicants' have submitted a clean version of the specification, see Response to Office Action submitted January 22, 2004 as Paper number 27.

Withdrawn Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn in light of Applicants' arguments.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 15 and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not establish enabling disclosure supporting the *in vivo* or *in vitro* implementation of the claimed composition comprising a deglycosylated kringle 1-3 region fragment of a plasminogen protein and optionally a naturally glycosylated kringle 1-3 region fragment. Applicants' specification evidences that deglycosylated kringle 1-3 region proteins have increased antiantiogenic activity as compared to glycosylated kringle 1-3 region proteins, however this evidence does not support Applicants' claimed invention, see Example 3 bridging pages 38 and 39. The claimed invention embraces a composition with two proteins, wherein the deglycosylated protein has antiantiogenic activity. The art as recent as 2002 states "...*in vitro* data have not been directly translated into antiantiogenic activity *in vivo*, see page 672 of Cao et al. (Curr. Med. Chem. –Anti-Cancer Agents, 2(6); 667-681, 2002). . Moreover, "[i]t should be cautiously emphasized that, due to its smaller size, K-1-3 may have a relatively short

Art Unit: 1642

half-life *in vivo*. Thus, antiangiogenic effect of a given compound must be tested in *in vivo* angiogenesis models but not only in *in vitro* endothelial cultures.", see column 1 of page 673.

In view of the analysis set forth above it would require undue experimentation for the skilled artisan to practice this invention because there is no support in the specification for the enablement of the broadly claimed invention. Therefore, in view of the insufficient guidance in the specification, extensive experimentation would be required to enable the claims. The breadth of the claims is broader than what is evidenced within the specification.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 15, 16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Claim 1 is vague and indefinite in the recitation "optionally". It is not clear whether or not a protein consisting of the naturally glycosylated kringle 1-3 region fragment of plasminogen is present in the composition or not. Applicants are requested to amend the claim such that it reads clearly and unambiguously.

b. Claim 4 is vague and indefinite in the recitation "the deglycosylated kringle 1-3 region fragment...corresponding to the N-glycosylation site of human plasminogen". It is not clear if the corresponding protein is similar or equivalent to the deglycosylated

kringle 1-3 fragment of the plasminogen protein. Accordingly, the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be determined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication number 2003/0012792 A1 (effective filing date May 22, 1998). U.S. patent application publication #2003/0012792 discloses a human sequence 61, a peptide of 260 amino acid residues which is the same as Applicants' SEQ ID NO: 2 deglycosylated kringle 1-3 region fragment, see attached sequence alignment and pages 70 and 71 of patent application.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alana M. Harris, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571)272-0831. The examiner works a flexible schedule, however she can normally be reached between the hours of 6:30 am to 5:30 pm, with alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 1642

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Siew can be reached on (571) 272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALANA M. HARRIS, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.
07 February 2005